



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,974	03/13/2006	Bong-Ho Lee	3364P210	3112
7590 Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman 7th Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90025			EXAMINER ABEBE, DANIEL DEMELASH	
			ART UNIT 2626	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/26/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/530,974

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel D. Abebe

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 8-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong et al. (5,737,030) and further in view of Finster et al. (2003/0149981).

As to claim 1, Hong teaches A system (Fig.4) for providing an electronic program guide supplied through a digital broadcasting system, comprising:

a service information receiver unit (42, 41) receiving service information transmitted from the digital broadcasting system and extracting the EPG information comprising visual and speech data from the service information, and storing the EPG information;

an EPG processor synthesizing the EPG information stored in the service information receiver unit into speech EPG information (52);

and a speech output unit (SP) producing the speech EPG information as speech (abstract; Col.2, lines 65-Col.3, line 15; Col.7, lines 1-15).

Its noted that while Hong teaches the claimed step of providing the program guide information verbally it doesn't explicitly teach classifying/tailoring the program guide information and selectively presenting them as claimed. Finster, however teaches

a system and method for generating a customized program guide information and selectively presenting the information to the viewer in accordance to the customization and the viewer's request (abstract; Pars.0005-0008, 0024, 0035-0036)

The step of classifying and selectively presenting the program guide in accordance to the user preference and request is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention for the purpose of reducing the amount of the program guide information that will be presented to the user and this step would be obvious in Hong's system for the same obvious reason.

As to claim 4, Hong teaches a user interface through which a user's request is input, and the EPG processor analyzes the request, extracts the information matched with the request by the user from among the EPG information stored in the memory unit, and converts the extracted EPG information into speech EPG information (Figs.5-6, Fig.1, 40).

As to claim 5, the steps of synthesizing the EPG information to speech and presenting vocally upon the user request has been addressed by Hong and the step of presenting a customized program guide according to the user preference and request is taught by Finster as shown above.

As to claim 8, Hong teaches where the receiver unit includes: a tuner receiving a digital broadcasting signal transmitted from the digital broadcasting system; a demultiplexer separating video, audio, data stream, and service information contained in

the stream information from each other; an EPG generator generating EPG information from the separated service information; an (inherent) demodulator for demodulating the digital broadcasting signal and a storage unit storing the EPG information (Fig.4).

As to claim 9, Hong teaches the system further comprising a graphic output unit displaying the EPG information processed by the EPG processor (Figs.5-6).

As to claim 10, Hong teaches wherein the EPG information may be produced as speech simultaneously while being displayed (Col.3, lines 1-15; Figs.5-6).

With regard to claim 11, the corresponding method of verbally providing customized program guide as claimed is analogous to claim 1 and therefore rejected by Hong in view of Finister for the foregoing reasons.

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong et al. and Finister et al. as applied above, and further in view of Kato et al. (2002/0120451).

As to claims 2-3, Hong doesn't explicitly teach where the EPG information is converted into proper sentence format. Kato teaches a system for providing information by speech for multiple applications where a received text is converted into characters and wherein the characters are processed to form a proper sentence and outputted as speech information (abstract; Par.0008, 0019). The claimed invention including this feature would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of Hong and Kato teachings for the purpose of presenting voice based program guide information in a proper and complete sentence format.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong et al. and Finister et al. as applied above, and further in view of Junqua et al. (6,314,398).

As to claim 6, Hong doesn't explicitly teach using speech recognition for controlling the EPG system. Junqua teaches an interactive EPG system where the system comprises an EPG processor to process the EPG information for producing characters and knowledge base from the EPG for recognizing speech command and for use by speech recognition system (Claim 18). The use of speech recognition would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention in order to provide the user hands free navigation of the EPG information.

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hong et al. and Finister et al. as applied above, and further in view of Kato et al. (2002/0120451).

As to claims 12-13, Hong doesn't explicitly teach where the EPG information is converted into proper sentence format. Kato teaches a system for providing information by speech for multiple applications where a received text is converted into characters and wherein the characters are processed to form a proper sentence and outputted as speech information (abstract; Par.0008, 0019). The motivation for including this feature would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as argued for claims 2 and 3 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wehmeyer (6,169,543)

Nainpally et al. (20030105639) ;

Chang (2004/0168187)

Hong et al. (0024868)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel D. Abebe whose telephone number is 571-272-7615. The examiner can normally be reached on monday-friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571-272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Daniel D Abebe/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626